

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 10, 2006.

Election

In the Office Action, the Examiner required the claims to be restricted to one of two alleged inventions: (1) Group I, including claims 52-73 and 80-81; and (2) Group II including claims 74-79. Applicants hereby elect to proceed with Group I, including claims 52-73 and 80-81. Claims 74-79 have been cancelled without prejudice so that they can be submitted with a divisional application. Applicants make this election to further the prosecution process. This election is not meant to indicate that the Applicants agree or disagree with the restriction requirement.


The Examiner also indicated that the application contains claims directed to seven patentably distinct species. Applicant disagrees with the requirement to elect a single disclosed species. Additionally, the Examiner has not provided a factual basis for the requirement to elect a single disclosed species. To further the prosecution process, Applicant elects Species IV, Figures 6-7. All claims currently pending are readable on Figures 6 and 7. Applicant also asserts that all of the pending claims are generic to all seven species. Therefore, the election to one of the alleged species is not proper.

In view of the above Amendments and Remarks, reconsideration of claims 52-73 and 80-81 is requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this document, including any fee for extension of time, which may be requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 8, 2006

By: 
Burt Magen
Reg. No. 37,175

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, California 94105
Telephone: 415.369.9660
Facsimile: 415.369.9665